



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,912	10/14/2003	Michael A. Stokke	MS301462.1 / MSFTP462US	3556
27195 7590 06/19/2007 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER OSBERG, THUY THANH	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/684,912

Applicant(s)

STOKKE ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Osberg

Art Unit

2179

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-29 and 31-32.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


WEILUN LO

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that "that the Examiner incorrectly contends that Schaefer teaches "a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component based, at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store and information stored in a command information store. Schaefer neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Schaefer that directly teach "a navigation component (par [0037], lines 3-6, test engine component; par [0057], FIG. 3 illustrates three GUI windows for an exemplary software program 185 for a Flight Reservation System. As shown in FIG. 3, the user interfaces include a Login window 300 for logging into a Flight Reservation System, a Flight Reservations window 330 for making flight reservations, and an Available Flights window 360 for selecting from a list of available flights. Thus, a user 210 desiring to test the functionality of the software program for the Flight Reservation System may generate three GUI maps 230, one for each of the three GUI windows. For example, a GUI map for Login window 300 may have a filename "Login.GUI"; a GUI map for Flight Reservations window 330 may have a filename "Flight Reservations.GUI"; and a GUI map for Available Flights window 360 may have a filename "Available Flights.GUI". The GUI maps may be stored in the same directory as the software program 185 on secondary storage 130) that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component (par [0038], lines 1-3 and 5-8, that the test engine component facilitates the simulated user interface; par [0041]; par [0051]; par [0054]-[0055]; par [0071]) based, at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store (par [0041], lines 1-3; par [0043]; par [0045]; fig. 2, label 230; par [0048], that the GUI map files may have the file extension ".GUI" and may be stored on secondary storage 130) and information stored in a command information store (par [0041], lines 8-14; par [0043]; par [0045]; par [0049]; once a GUI map 230 is created, user 210 may access a GUI translator component 160 to translate GUI map 230 into a set of tables 240. The set of tables 240 may be stored in database 135; [0050], that the data in tables 240 may include one or more test cases, which define sequences or paths of transitions that the software program takes during execution. The tables 240 may include a PAGE_ABBR table and a PAGE_FLOW table. PAGE_ABBR table may store an abbreviated name and a logical name for each window of the software program 185. Each row in the PAGE_FLOW table may represent an execution path for testing a software program 185 and may correspond to a particular test case. The PAGE_ABBR table may include a column PAGE_ABBR with data that corresponds to data in a Page Sequence section of the PAGE_FLOW table). As stated above by the Examiner the teachings of Schaefer clearly show the method and system to facilitate user interface automation. The Examiner provided the information above which clearly states that map information store is stored with a ".GUI" extension and provides functionality to the automation component by translating the GUI map (map information store) into a set of tables (command information store) which describes the applicants claims as stated in claim 1.

Applicant argues that "the Examiner again erroneously asserts that Schaefer teaches storing data, commands and executables associated with the user interface separately which provides a modular system which can be modified without recompilation of executables, with respect to dependent claims 31 and 32.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Schaefer that directly teach "storing data, commands and executables associated with the user interface separately which provides a modular system which can be modified without recompilation of executables" using the following paragraphs [0041] and [0045], that in addition, secondary storage may include a database for storing a plurality of tables, which was further described in paragraph [0011], that in accordance with another aspect of the present invention, systems and methods are provided for translating one or more user interface maps into a set of tables to facilitate testing of a software program. Such systems and methods receive a request to translate a user interface map into a set of tables, wherein the request includes a filename for the software program; retrieve a list of user interface map files that exist in a directory specified by the filename; and create the set of tables based on the retrieved list of the user interface map files) and further paragraph [0012], that in accordance with yet another aspect of the present invention, systems and methods are provided for inputting data into a set of tables to facilitate interface a first information identifying a sequence for activating user interfaces in the software program; receive in a second user interface a second information specifying an execution path of the software program; store the first information in a first table; and store the second information in a group of tables). This would provide a modular way to execute the testing by storing data, commands and executables associated with a user interface in three separate tables to be executed individually. This meets what is claimed by the applicant in claims 31 and 32.

Applicant argues that the subject invention as recited in claim 4 "configuration information store comprises a text-based file" is not obvious over Schaefer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Schaefer that directly teaches the obviousness of "a text-based file" (par [0047], that HTML is a text based file; par [0048]), lines 11-14, that GUI map may be generated manually by entering information about a window and the objects on the window into a text file. Alternatively, a GUI map may be created through a GUI map editor, such as the one provided by the Mercury WinRunner product. GUI map files may have the file extension ".GUI" and may be stored on secondary storage 130.). It is clear that Schaefer teaches "configuration information store comprises a text-based file". The Examiner stands by the rejection with the additional reference from Schaefer added.

Applicant argues that Schaefer and Minard either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims "rejection of claim 2". Minard relates to development system with application browser user interface and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Schaefer with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 2 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 2 is not obvious over the combination of Schaefer and Minard. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants arguments and now added additional references from Minard that when combined with the teachings of Schaefer directly teaches "the automation component is a wizard" (fig. 4A; col. 3, lines 27-31; fig. 6, the image showing the wizard menu along with the description of functions; col. 8, lines 41-51). Further it is known by one skilled in the art that a wizard is a user interface element where the user is led through a sequence of dialogs as clearly shown in figure 6. The Examiner stands by the rejection with the additional reference from Minard as stated above

Applicant argues that Schaefer and Zimniewiez either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Zimniewiez relates to system and method for providing multiple installation actions and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Schaefer with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 12 and 13 depend), 22 (from which claim 23 depends) and independent claim 25 (from which claim 26 depends).

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner has noted the applicants' arguments and now added an additional reference from Schaefer (par. [0110], that by when test data is to be entered into a text field, test engine component 170 may call an insert text function. Software controller component 173 may transmit an appropriate instruction to the software program 185 to input the data into the object and may return the result of the processing of the instruction by the software program 185 to test engine component 170) that when combined with the teachings of Zimniewiez directly teaches "input component performs input validation upon the request and provides error information if the request is invalid". It is clear to one skilled in the art the combination of Zimniewiez and Schaefer teach the input component performs input validation upon the request and provides error information if the request is invalid.